Remarks

This is filed in response to the Office Action mailed November 28, 2003, citing various objections to the application and rejecting the claims as allegedly unpatentable over Dodrill (US 6,490,564) and/or Danne (US 6,226,286). The specification and claims are amended to remove all grounds for objection and rejection, as discussed below. In view thereof, the Applicant requests that this application be passed forward to issuance.

Priority Claim

The Examiner contends, in ¶ 2 of the Office Action, that application is not entitled to the benefit of priority of the cited provisional applications. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Contrary to the assertion in ¶ 2 of the Office Action, the standard for entitlement is whether the present application is for an invention which is disclosed in the provisional in the manner required under 35 USC 112, ¶ 1 — namely, by way of a written description in such clear, concise and exact terms as to enable persons of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention (and the best mode for practicing the same). Regardless of whether the terms claimed in the present application are used *per se* in the cited provisional applications (the standard mistakenly recited in ¶ 2 of the Office Action), those provisionals clearly describe the invention of the present application in the manner required by 35 USC 112, ¶ 1. A change in terminology, if any, is immaterial.

Description of the Prior Art

Contrary to the assertion in ¶ 3 of the Office Action, the Applicant does not intend to posture Figures 1 – 3, nor the accompanying text, as descriptions of the prior art. As clearly set forth, for example, at page 15, line 3 of the application "FIGURE 1 illustrates an exemplary telecommunications system 10 according to the invention..." Furthermore, as noted at page 15, line 12, "The ... system 10 of the invention offers a variety of network and external system interfaces, as depicted in FIGURE 2." Still further, as noted at page 7, line 9, "Figure 3 schematically illustrates the interaction of a TSP node of a system of the invention with ... exemplary external networks."

The Applicant has utilized the Background of Invention section, at pages 1 – 3, as intended and contemplated by the Patent Laws. This is likewise true of the Detailed Description, beginning at page 15. No further changes are dictated by the law. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to specification.

The Title is Amended

In response to ¶ 4 of the Office Action, the Title is amended to better indicate the invention to which this application pertains. The Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to Title.

The Abstract is Amended

In response to ¶ 5 of the Office Action, the Abstract is amended for still better compliance with the rules. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to Abstract.

No Change to the Drawings is Required

Consistent with remarks above, the Applicant does not intend to posture Figures 1 – 3 as descriptions of the prior art. The change requested by the Examiner in ¶ 6 is, therefore, not appropriate. The Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to drawings.

Claims Are Amended for Form

In response to ¶ 8 of the Office Action, the claims are amended to remove the term "hereinafter." In response to ¶ 9, claim 32 is amended to insure proper antecedent basis for the term "feature control module."

In response to ¶ 10 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 29 stand fully in accord with 35 USC 112, in their use of the term "instantiating ... an object." This term is used in the conventional manner of the OOP (object-oriented programming) art to indicate the creation of a run-time instance of an abstraction defined by a class.

Though not necessarily prior art, this is corroborated by the website WhatIs? (www.whatis.com), which provides a more eloquent definition:

> **instantiation**
>
> In programming, instantiation is the creation of a real instance or particular realization of an abstraction or template such as a class of objects or a computer process. To instantiate is to create such an instance by, for example, defining one particular variation of object within a class, giving it a name, and locating it in some physical place.
>
> 1) In object-oriented programming, some writers say that you instantiate a class to create an object, a concrete instance of the class. The object is an executable file that you can run in a computer.
>
> 2) In the object-oriented programming language, Java, the object that you instantiate from a class is, confusingly enough, called a class instead of an object. In other words, using Java, you instantiate a class to create a specific class that is also an executable file you can run in a computer.
>
> 3) In approaches to data modeling and programming prior to object-oriented programming, one usage of instantiate was to make a real (data-filled) object from an abstract object as you would do by creating an entry in a database table (which, when empty, can be thought of as a kind of class template for the objects to be filled in).
>
> See, http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/0,,sid9_gci212355,00.html

The Applicant's usage of "instantiate" and "object" throughout the application is consistent with these definitions.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection, in ¶ 11, to usage of the terms "call feature," "service," "operations," "selected event," and so forth, in claims 1 – 40. The meaning of these terms is self-evident to those of ordinary skill in the art from a direct reading of the claims. Moreover, that meaning is fully consistent with usage of those terms throughout the specification. For example, the term "call feature or service" means a feature of a call or a service provided in connection with a call. By way of further example, "operations" means steps or actions. By way of still further example, "selected event" means a given event.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the object to claims under 35 USC 112.

The Claims are Patentably Distinct from the Cited Art

In ¶¶ 12 – 17, the Examiner rejects the claimed invention as anticipated by Dodrill or obvious over Dodrill in view of Danne. As discussed below, those references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Pending claim 1, for example, is directed to a method for providing telecommunications services including the step of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language of operations for performing a call feature or service. The method further includes instantiating a context object that (i) accesses the compiled representation in response to one or more events, and (ii) effects execution of those operations.

Nowhere does Dodrill suggest using a compiled representation of a call feature or service that is described, textually, by a mark-up language. Instead, Dodrill contents itself with utilizing mark-up language descriptions, namely, those in XML. There is no suggestion that such representations could or should by compiled, e.g., by an XML parser/compiler, or otherwise.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Dodrill that such a compiled representation could be accessed by an instantiated object (here, a "context" object) in response to an event.

Nor, is there suggestion in Dodrill that a compiled representation, so accessed, could be used by such a context object to effect execution of an operation defined by the original textual description.

Again, Dodrill contents itself with utilizing mark-up language descriptions.

For this reason, Dodrill fails to anticipate claim 1, nor independent claims 12, 22, 24, and 32, which also call for — among other things — generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language of operations for performing a call feature or service.

Danne fails to remedy the deficiencies of Dodrill. That reference also fails to suggest using a compiled representation of a call feature or service that is described, textually, by a mark-up language. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Danne that such a compiled representation could be accessed by an instantiated object (here, a "context" object) in response to an event. Nor, is there

suggestion in Danne that a compiled representation, so accessed, could be used by such a context object to effect execution of an operation defined by the original textual description.

For these reasons, among others, the cited art fails to render obvious the independent claims, much less, the other claims which depend and recite further limitations thereon.

Conclusion

This responds in full to the Office Action mailed November 28, 2003, in the above cited batter. The application is amended for form and the claims are shown to be patentably distinct form the art. In view hereof, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections, so that this application may be passed forward to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,
NUTTER, McCLENNEN & FISH, LLP

4/28/04

David J. Powsner
Reg. No. 31,868

Attorney for Applicant
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210-2604
Tel: (617)439-2717
Fax: (617)310-9717